R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 664 CG 000 094

SIGNIFICANT ADULTS, CARETAKERS, AND STRUCTURES OF OPPORTUNITY--AN EXPLORATORY STUDY.

BY- RIVERA, RAMON J. SHORT, JAMES F., JR.
WASHINGTON STATE UNIV., PULLMAN

PUB DATE NOV 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.80 45P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUVENILE GANGS, ADULTS, YOUTH, SUBCULTURE, *MIDDLE CLASS, *LOWER CLASS, *MALES, *YOUTH LEADERS, PULLMAN, CHICAGO, STREET CORNER GROUPS AND PATTERNS OF DELINQUENCY

IN THIS STUDY, THE AUTHORS EXPLORE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN YOUTHS AND THOSE ADULTS WHO MAY GUIDE THEM IN THE VALUES AND OPPORTUNITIES OF THE ADULT WORLD. IT IS ONE OF A SERIES OF FOUR STUDIES BASED ON THE CHICAGO STUDY. "STREET CORNER GROUPS AND PATTERNS OF DELINQUENCY." ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHT BOYS WERE TAKEN FROM THE POPULATION OF THE ABOVE STUDY AND WERE ASKED TO GIVE THE NAMES OF FOUR ADULTS WITH WHOM THEY TALKED REGULARLY. THESE BOYS AND THE ADULTS THEY CHOSE WERE DIVIDED INTO THE FOLLOWING GROUPS--(1) NEGRO GANG, (2) NEGRO LOWER CLASS, (3) NEGRO MIDDLE CLASS, (4) WHITE GANG, (5) WHITE LOWER CLASS, AND (6) WHITE MIDDLE CLASS. INTERVIEWS WERE THEN HELD WITH 146 ADULTS WHOSE MEDIAN AGE RANGED FROM 35 TO 47. IN THE MIDDLE CLASS COMMUNITIES MORE OF THE ADULTS CHOSEN WERE KNOWN THROUGH PEERS, SUCH AS A FRIEND'S PARENT. IN THE LOWER CLASS COMMUNITIES, THE ADULTS NOMINATED WERE OFTEN "CARETAKERS," ADULTS KNOWN THROUGH FORMAL SETTINGS SUCH AS THE SCHOOL OR CHURCH. ADULTS CHOSEN BY THE GANG BOYS WERE MORE OFTEN NOT IN CARETAKER ROLES AND OF LOWER SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS. THE MOST SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS OF THE INTERVIEWERS WERE THAT ADOLESCENTS ARE NOT AS ANTAGONISTIC TOWARD ADULTS AS OFTEN PROPOSED, AND THAT BOYS IN GANGS ARE NOT IN CONTACT WITH ADULTS WHO ARE OFFERING GUIDANCE FOR FUTURE LIFE AND WORK. (NS)

ED011664

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SIGNIFICANT ADULTS, CARETAKERS, AND STRUCTURES OF OPPORTUNITY: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY*

RAMON J. RIVERA
JAMES F. SHORT, JR.

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

NOVEMBER, 1966

CG 000 094

The Chicago study of "Street Corner Groups and Patterns of Delinquency" had as its primary focus the generation of knowledge concerning gang delinquency.[1] The research was designed in such a way as to permit comparative study of observations and responses of Negro and white boys in each of the following categories: lower class gang and nongang, and middle class nongang. Boys in the gang categories were broadly representative of Chicago's "worst" during the period of study, particularly as concerns conflict, excessive consumption of alcohol, illicit sexual behavior, and property crimes of great variety. The YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago, through their Program for Detached Workers, was in effective contact with the gangs, having been directed to them by various community agencies and by field investigations which sought to locate repersentatives of major hypothesized "delinquent subcultures."

Lower class nongang boys were contacted through social agencies in the gang areas, such as YMCAs, Boy's Clubs, and Settlement Houses. Their nongang status was attested to by agency personnel and the detached workers. A measure of research control thus was obtained over "community factors" in selectivity for gang membership. Middle class boys were chosen from HIY clubs in two areas of the city which, by conventional ecological criteria, justified this classification. We were directed to these clubs by YMCA personnel who agreed that these boys provided the best "contrast" groups in the city, so far as their class orientation was concerned. The white middle class boys, especially, had the reputation of being the "cream of the YMCA crop."

These samples of Chicago adolescents have become the subjects of a series of special inquiries deriving mainly from current theory and speculation

in the area of adolescent behavior, and delinquent behavior in particular. This paper represents a continuation of that series and has as its special point of interest the relationships existing between these youngsters and the world of adults which surrounds them.

Adults and Adolescents: Some Theoretical Considerations

In 1937 this passage appeared in an article by Edward Reuter:

> An Adolescent world--an area of human experience lying between childhood and adulthood and in a measure apart from each--appears to be a phenomenon of our time and a product of our cultural organization. . . . As any other culture complex, it is essentially a system of collective definitions that creates a world apart.[2]

These sentences appeared in 1962 in a book by Ernest Smith:

> The exclusion of American youth from significant adult activities, combined with the widespread conflict between youth and adults, leads to the withdrawal of youth from institutions sponsored or controlled by adults.[3]
>
> . . . the underlying conflict of the two cultures--youth versus adult--is fundamental and may develop into crises as both parental exasperation and youth resentment accumulate.[4]

There is an obvious continuity in these passages, and the point of view represented--the "youth culture" perspective--received strong support between 1937 and 1962 in the relevant work of Benedict, Davis, Parsons, and Coleman.[5] In fact, the "youth culture" perspective can be described as the accepted and traditional mode of theorizing about adult-adolescent relationships in modern America. It is not unfair to label these works as contributions to a theory of <u>devisiveness</u>. The integration of adolescents and adults is viewed as an attribute of some societies, present during earlier, certainly more idyllic days, but clearly absent from the contemporary scene. Adolescents, in this view, are more adolescent than they used to be. They

most certainly do not seem to be persons becoming adults and interacting with them in any meaningful way.

There have been occasional departures from this point of view. Nye, Withey and Douvan, Douvan and Kaye, and Elkin and Westley have, implicitly or directly, challenged the existence of a pervasive and continuing tension between adolescents and adults.[6] Our research on this problem, while cognizant of the "youth culture" perspective and its critics, was even more directly shaped by an attempt to evaluate and operationalize a theory which stems from a different tradition entirely--Cloward and Ohlin's "theory of differential opportunity".[7]

Briefly, this theory argues that the genesis of specialized types of delinquent adaptation lies, to an important degree, in differential exposure to structures of opportunity. The theory is familiar to criminologists and has been summarized in other project papers.[8] Cloward and Ohlin's use of such terms as "opportunity structures," "legitimate and illegitimate means," "role models," "integration of age levels," etc., clearly implies that somewhere within the institutional or informal social context of an adolescent's life there exist individuals who can offer or withhold keys to certain sectors of adult status. Presumably these individuals are often adults. An important question then becomes: Who are the older persons who function, for the adolescents, as mediators of the values and opportunities of the outside world?

Direct field observation, and continuing interviews with the detached workers, provided a valuable "window" through which we were able to observe the behavior of delinquent boys within the context of local community life. Very early in the project our attention was drawn to the relationships

that existed between these adolescents and the adults who were part of their everyday world.[9] We began to explore the possibility of some type of community study (or series of studies) that would put us into direct contact with these individuals.

A survey of the literature suggested that an undretaking of this type would be almost unique in the field of juvenile delinquency.[10] It also suggested that such a study might prove impossibie because of the "underlying conflict" between adolescents and adults so often referred to in the literature. We were faced with a curious dilemma. On one hand we had evidence (the observer and detached worker reports) which argued that adolescents quite frequently interacted with community adults; on the other hand were arguments that meaningful contact of this type was virtually nonexistent. The problem struck us as intriguing enough to warrant a modest investment of funds for research. This paper outlines the research strategy followed, and presents a number of findings from the study which ensued.

Securing Nominations

We hoped to be able to locate and to interview samples of adults who were in effective contact with the boys. Initially, we considered straightforward community studies of selected areas, i.e., contacting every nth dwelling unit in a given neighborhood, and interviewing a sample of randomly selected local residents. This strategy was rejected, largely on the grounds that such a prodedure could never guarantee that the adults contacted had any meaningful relationship with the boys. We were, of course, interested in the characteristics of community adults, but this interest was made

selective by our conviction that primary attention should be directed to those older presons who figured significantly in the lives of our boys.

An alternate strategy was adopted, one that placed the major burden of sample selection on the youngsters themselves. Our solution was simply to encourage the boys to provide us with the names of those adults with whom they regularly interacted. (We assumed that the adolescents would know adults who could meet this criterion.) At the moment this decision was made, we were in the early stages of administering a personal interview to many of the youngsters involved in the program. The interview schedule was quickly adapted to include a sequence of items requesting from each boy, the names, addresses, and occupations of "the four adults with whom you have the most contact." We were primarily concerned with the character of adolescent-adult relations within the broad context of community life and, in line with this emphasis, a respondent's immediate family members were explicitly excluded from nomination. As it turned out (cf. Table 2 below), other boys were quick to fill this gap by nominating a large number of adult relatives of their peers. At the close of interviewing, relevant data (names, addresses, etc.) had been secured from 458 boys.

Each boy had been asked for four names, and the sheer volume of adults identified by this procedure, together with our limited financial resources, dictated a narrowing of research interests to a more manageable number of potential respondents. The basic design of the over-all study suggested the appropriateness of selecting a sample of adults from each of the six categories which had guided the initial choice of adolescents in this study NG, NLC, etc.). Since the gang and lower class control youngsters were selected from the same areas of the city, we could easily match

the gang samples with their appropriate LC controls and thus compare the characteristics and responses of adults nominated by gang and nongang boys in the same neighborhood.

Accordingly, two lower class communities (Negro and white) were selected on the basis of the delinquency involvement of the gang boys and because of the relative richness of supporting material from other sources of data collection.[11] Our limited selection of middle class adolescents yielded two groups (Negro and white) and two communities which seemed fairly representative, given our previous experience with these categories of urban adolescents. Our attention was thus centered on four Chicago communities, the adolescents within them, and the adults who had captured their attention.

Nominees and Samples for the Six Groups

Table 1 indicates the name and size of each group of adolescents selected to generate respondents for the adult interviews. Each boy had been asked to nominate four adults, and the third column of the table indicated, at least for nongang boys, that this request was generally followed by the adolescents. We might pause to underline the significance of this point. The boys seemed to have little difficulty in nominating adults beyond their family circles with whom they were in regular contact. These data, if taken as rough indicators of age-grade integration, suggest that integration of this type is characteristic of the communities selected, although it is somewhat less pronounced among boys who are members of delinquent gangs.

Table 1 About Here

The table also documents a second point, which was seriously to modify our research strategy. Altogether, a total of 158 adolescents offered a total of 579 adult nominations. Even allowing for multiple nominations--i.e., the fact that more than one boy in a group may have nominated the same adult--the adolescents had generated six samples of adults that offered more potential respondents than we could afford to interview. However, the fact that a large number of multiple nominations had been received suggested a tactic for reducing the case loads for our interviewers and, hopefully, for enhancing the relevance of the study.

The tactic was a simple one. Each sample of adults was stratified into two categories: the names of those persons who had been nominated by more than one boy were placed in a special group, those adults nominated only once were grouped separately. We set out to interview every adult who was a multiple nominee, plus randomly selected adults nominated by only one boy in each of the six groups. At this point our samples had become frankly purposive, the selection procedure depending largely on the relative salience of a given adult for a given group of adolescents. Our departure from conventional sampling procedures, imposed mainly by reasons of economy, was made more palatable by the realization that the solution accepted would maximize, for this study, the probability that we would be interviewing those adults who were important to a number of boys within the original groups of adolescents.

Locating multiple nominees proved to be a relatively simple task. Since more than one boy had volunteered the name and address, we were provided with a built-in check on the accuracy of our identifying information. The check was a welcome corrective device, especially in the lower class areas where

youngsters were apt to be hazy about the precise addresses of the adults they had nominated. The problems we encountered tracking down respondents in these communities are suggested by the following exchange that occurred as a Negro gang boy nominated a girl named "Dee Dee."

> Interviewer: "Under what circumstances do you see Dee Dee?"
>
> Respondent: "Mostly I see her in a restaurant on Market and Rockford. I dance with her."
>
> Interviewer: "Does Dee Dee have a job?"
>
> Respondent: "She a prostitute."
>
> Interviewer: "Where does she live?"
>
> Respondent: "I don't know." (Probe) "Somewhere on Rockford. The 1200 block."

Dee Dee was nominated only once, but she was among those randomly selected for interviews in the NG adult sample. We never managed to locate her (she had apparently moved from the neighborhood). At the height of our search we had the active cooperation of the Rattlers (the gang from which her nomination came) and a number of Dee Dee's former colleagues, but all to no avail.

Instances of vagueness concerning names and addresses were relatively common, and they seemed to be most prevalent among lower class (G and LC) boys.

Characteristics of the Respondents

Interviews were successfully completed with 146 adults. A high proportion of these persons (85%) either lived or worked in the communities where the boys themselves had been found. Another 11 per cent had lived or worked there at one time, but at the moment of their interview they were located elsewhere in the city. The boys had not been asked to

limit their choices to neighborhood adults, but, given an opportunity to define the scope of their adult contacts, most of the youngsters had restricted themselves to older persons in their immediate milieu.

Table 2 About Here

Table 2 presents additional data describing the adult respondents. The mean number of (adolescent) nominations per (adult) respondent, ranging from 1.3 to 2.5, directly reflects our effort to enhance the representation of multiple nominees, i.e., adults nominated by more than one boy. The median ages of the six categories of respondents ranges between 35 and 47 years. These figures do not demonstrate a consistent pattern by race or class or gang status, but it is interesting to note that the adolescent nominators (who are roughly 16-17 years of age) did not concentrate their choices within a young adult age category (e.g., 20-29 yrs.). Typically, they selected persons who were more mature. At first glance this finding suggests a hopeful note for it implies that these youngsters may have been open to the influence of more experienced members of the civilian labor force. Presumably, these would be individuals well situated to advise adolescents on existing career opportunities and the contemporary realities of the world of work.

The fourth column of the table presents the percent of each category of adults who are female. The column has a special relevance. Most discussions of the social organization of the American Negro community emphasize the prevalence of female dominance within the typical Negro household.[12] Here we shift our attention from the immediate family to the wider community and examine the relative dominance of females within the adult milieu of

these adolescents. A glance at the column of figures tells us that females constitute a minority of the respondents for each group; within this overall pattern we also note that females are more often found in the Negro samples than in the white.

The next column of the table presents the proportion of adult respondents with adolescent members in their own households. Perusal of the completed interviews indicates that this designation ordinarily identifies adults who come to the attention of the boys in the normal course of interaction between a youngster and his age mates. The boys come to know parents of friends, adult relatives of girl(s) they date, boarders at friends' homes, and older persons (with teen-agers of their own) whose interest in adolescents have led them to volunteer work with Boy Scout troops, etc. These are adult-adolescent relationships, to be sure, but they represent a particular type of relationship--one that is made available to youngsters by virtue of their own peer relationships. Very often these adults are relatives of the other young people he knows.

The preceeding category of respondent suggests the appropriateness of examining the distribution of a related (and occasionally overlapping) type of adult nominee. These would be adults who come to the attention of adolescents in a more formal or more strictly institutional setting. Borrowing from Gans,[13] we shall call them caretakers; in the context of this report, the term caretaker will be used to refer to any adult who, in the course of his ordinary daily activities, comes into contact with adolescents as a representative of some larger adult-dominated institution that is formally committed to guide or to change the behavior of youth. The proportion of caretakers in each sample of adolescents appears in the

final column of Table 2. As we examine this column of figures, we note also the specific types of caretakers contacted (see Table 3), and the significance of their activities on the local community scene.

Table 3 About Here

A. Types of Caretakers: Table 3 lists the specific caretaker roles that were identified within each group of adult respondents. Initially we might observe that there were more than a few such persons; on an over-all basis almost one-third (30%) of the 146 adults interviewed could be classified as occupants of caretaker roles. Their functions can be summarized as follows:

Caretaker Roles	Percent As A Proportion of All Caretakers	Percent As A Proportion of the Combined Samples
Detached Worker and other YMCA and Youth Center Personnel	40%	12%
High School Teachers and related personnel	27	8
Clergy and related personnel	20	6
Boy Scout personnel	7	2
Other	7	2
	101%*	30%

The proportion of YMCA and other Youth Center personnel in these samples comes as no surprise. The study, after all, originally located its youngsters through agencies such as these, and it stands to reason that

---

*Higher than 100% because one adult was coded into two categories

when the boys were asked to nominate "significant" adults, a number of them would refer us back to the staff of their local youth center. Perhaps it is noteworthy that there were not more such nominations. That is, given our method of locating youngsters, the fact that only 12% of all adult respondents were agency personnel may strike some as surprising. Thus the proportion may be viewed as rather large, or rather small, depending on one's point of view.

Smaller clusters of caretaker roles can be identified with other major institutional settings. Thus we find additional groups of adult respondents whose relationship with children would seem to flow primarily from their positions as teachers (27% of all caretakers), religious figures (20% of all caretakers), and Scouting personnel (7% of all caretakers). The significance of adolescent exposure to these specialized adult roles, and the more basic question of their availability to young persons, is likely to vary from community to community and, within communities, from adolescent group to adolescent group. These questions are addressed below.

B. Caretakers: Their Availability And Significance: At this point it is appropriate to ask: What does the presence of caretakers (and the types of caretakers who are present) tell us about the communities that were surveyed in Chicago? Let us begin with a NG-HLC neighborhood--the Market Street area.

Market Street is overwhelmingly Negro and largely dilapidated. To the typical caretaker, it offered what amounted to a textbook example of a neighborhood gone to seed. Caretakers existed, and in large numbers. Did the boys notice them?

The non-gang boys did. Sixty percent of the NLC adults interviewed were caretakers, a figure that is about 50% larger than the comparable proportion of NG adult respondents. The difference is considerable and readers are reminded that these nominations were offered by boys who lived in the same community. It is also useful to remember that the Detached Worker Program was specifically aimed at those young persons who were felt to be largely ignored by conventional caretaker agencies. The fact that nine NG boys (27% of the Rattlers) nominated their Worker as a "significant" adult, and that only one other caretaker appears in the NG adult sample suggests that the YMCA's motives were not entirely illusionary. It is also instructive to examine the types of caretakers interviewed from the NLC nominations, if only to underline their absence from the NG adult sample.

Thus we note, within the group of NLC adult respondents, nine YMCA or Youth Center caretakers and three school teachers. Together these individuals collected 34 nominations from the boys, wich amounts to 58% of all the nominations that the NLC offered to our interviewers. Our NLC comparision group, then, is heavily dominated by institutionalized roles, and their adult incumbents actually seem to have "captured" the loyalty of their "clients"--given all of their adult contacts to choose from, the NLC boys tended to nominate their caretakers. The contrast with NG boys is striking.

We find a somewhat similar picture if we examine the number and the type of caretakers interviewed in our low status white categories. WLC adult respondents more often represent institutionalized roles, but in this case the margin over the WG group of adults is only 13%. More instructive are the specific caretaker roles which appear in each sample.

WG boys nominated caretakers who exist to answer the special needs of boys who are in trouble. We find a detached worker, a lawyer, and a probation officer, as well as a civic emmissary (Community Relations Aide) assigned to a neighborhood that needs "help". Other adolescents (WLC) in the same community nominate their teachers, a minister, and the officers of their local recreation centers. In this comparison it appears that the types of caretakers who become salient to groups of adolescent boys reflect the degree to which they are in "trouble".

The middle class groups present quite different profiles. NMC adults are seldom caretakers, but they are often community adults with teen-age children of their own. The group of WMC adult respondents is also weighted in this direction, but it does include a sizeable number of clergymen, teachers, and scouting personnel. The picture presented by the WMC adult sample is close to that offered by Elkin and Westley in their study of a Canadian suburb.[14] Control of the environment and protection of adolescents from disruptive events is a task shared jointly by parents and caretakers. For the NMC group it is the parents of group members (rather than caretakers) who predominate in this particular type of community context.

A final point should be made concerning the presence of caretakers. Relative to the educational and income characteristics of the entire civilian labor force, professional caretakers tend to be persons of high socioeconomic status. The Duncan SES scale, for example, ranks teachers, group workers and clergymen along with lawyers, engineers and real estate agents, at the "top of the heap"---that is, at the ninth or tenth decile in an SES ranking of all American occupations.[15] (See Table 4)

Table 4 About Here

The significance of this fact for low-status youngsters should not be overlooked. Groups of adolescents in urban slums which act to maximize contact with caretakers, are likely also to maximize exposure to individuals qualified to serve as role models for a middle class way of life. Table 5 contains relevant data.

Table 5 About Here

Section A of the table presents the mean (Duncan SES) decile rank of all adult respondents who are caretakers. Not unexpectedly, the mean ranks are quite high, ranging between 8.7 and 10.0.[16] Other community adults tend to be much lower in status; on an overall basis a margin of 3.6 deciles separates caretaker roles from other community adult respondents. This differential in adult status is especially characteristic of lower class communities, and it is most obvious in communities that are Negro.

Since the number and the proportion of caretakers varies across categories, their net contribution to the SES "mix" of a community varies as well. Part B of the table takes this factor into account, comparing the SES rank of all adult respondents to the status position of the families of the boys responsible for their nomination. Examining the bottom row of the table ("Observed Difference") we find in every case that the boys have nominated adults who tend, on the average, to be superior to them in terms of social status. An important part of this status differential is due to the contribution made by caretakers to the mean position of all community adult respondents. It would seem that the presence of caretakers or their realtive absence, may profoundly affect the SES characteristics of those adult roles available to youngsters in slum communities.

Adolescent-Adult Contacts: General

During the course of their personal interview, each adult respondent was handed a list of all the boys in the group from which the adult's nomination had been drawn. He (or she) was asked to indicate which names identified boys that were known personally and, for each identification made, the number of times, each week, that the adult respondent saw the boy. These data appear in Table 6.

Table 6 About Here

The typical adult respondent was able to recognize about six names on the group rosters. Stated differently (and taking into account the different sizes of the adolescent groups involved), this means that the average adult was able to identify about 24 percent of the boys in the group from which his nomination had come. Note that our "index of recognition" required each adult to know the first and last names of the boys involved.

The proportion of boys recognized on this basis (24%) strikes us as misleadingly low. Certainly among gang boys of both races, this figure could have been raised by including nicknames as part of our "index of recognition". The addition of photographs of the boys would have enhanced the probability of identification among all groups. Unfortunately, neither of these methods was employed and we can only recommend their future use.

Table 6 also indicates that the average adult had from two to five contacts per week with each boy indentified. There is no consistent pattern, by race or class or gang affiliation, in the figures given. However, substantive differences are revealed if we ask where these contacts occured and about the types of conversations that these older persons have with the boys they knew. These data appear in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 7 About Here

Table 7 presents the answers that adults gave to the question "Where do you generally see these boys? (Where do you generally have most of your contact with them?)." Responses categorized as "around the neighborhood" run a narrow gamut. Usually the adult has said "on the street" or something similar (for example "I see them on my way to the store", or "I only see them when I walk my dog"). We note that street-centered answers of this type are primarily characteristic of adults nominated by gang boys. Given what we already know of the characteristics of our adult respondents, the pattern of remaining answers is largely predictable. Thus, NLC boys have been "captured" by caretakers. The adults they nominate tend to see the boys in caretaker-dominated centers for adolescent activities (e.g., the YMCA). NMC boys nominated a large number of adults with teenagers of their own; these adults see the boys in the course of visits at the boys' home or their own. WLC adults (compared to their NLC counterparts) are less often agency-centered. They see the boys "around the neighborhood" or at home. WMC adults report an especially large number of agency contacts, and secondary encounters in the neighborhood and during home visits. What types of conversation occur when the generations meet? An answer is suggested in Table 8.

Table 8 About Here

After identifying his usual place of contact with the boys, each adult was asked "What are some of the things you're likely to talk about when you see them? (What's likely to come up in conversation?)" A glance at the first

category of responses ("School") shows striking differences between adults nominated by gang boys, on one hand, and all other respondents, on the other. The general issue of one's education almost never comes up in a conversation between a gang boy and the "significant" adults we interviewed. This is the most decisive pattern in the table, but other differences are also important:

1) There is a tendency for gang-nominated adults to report a somewhat higher proportion of discussions concerning the world of work,[17] but fewer conversations about conventional adolescent interests, such as sports and cars.

2) Gang boy-adult conversations involve chiefly neighborhood gossip and casual exchanges of greetings.

These points are worth underlining, if only because they are so obviously relevant to the general problem of structures of opportunity. In their conversations with adults, gang boys reveal themselves as relatively indifferent to more conventional adolescent interests, surely more indifferent to school; and much more likely to enter into conversations that, from a middle class perspective, would seem to be without much content.

But are such conversations actually contentless? They do seem to lack the instructional quality that appears to be an important component of exchanges between the generations in middle class communities. Middle class adults talk to adolescents about school. In so doing it seems likely that such sentiments are conveyed as "school is important", and "you must get all the education you can". As they talk, they teach. When the conversation does not dwell on education, it turns on topics that are specific to middle class images of adolescent life--sports, cars, etc. Discussions such as

these would seem to stress a measure of distance between the age grades. That is, MC adults appear to be presenting themselves as persons who are tolerant and encouraging about adolescent interests, but they also present themselves as persons who are more expert and sophisticated than adolescents, and thus as persons who are strategically situated to offer them advice.

This is exactly the quality that seems to be lacking in adult conversations with gang boys. These persons exchange greetings, they gossip; occasionally they speak of the world of work. By and large they are not communicating in a fashion that would underline, for the youngster, any sense of dependence on the expertise of persons who are older than he is. The generations appear to interact on a basis of equality, sharing concerns and exchanging information in a manner that seems to deny that there is any special significance to their positions as adults and adolescents.

Consider the following selection of responses which gang-nominated adults gave to the question, "What are some of the things you're likely to talk about when you see them (the boys)?":

> A NG adult (Case #150--Housewife): "Nothing but how do you do? How is your mother? Where are you going?"
>
> A WG adult (Case #512--Unemployed Entertainer): "Nothing. We just bullshit around. Nothing in particular."
>
> A NG adult (Case #125--Laborer, Poultry Market: "This depends on what they are doing when I see them. Sometimes they're shooting craps in the alley. I say What are you trying to do? Get some rest in California? That sort of stuff." 18
>
> A WG adult (Case #543--Laborer, Road Maintenance): "Whose in jail? What happened to this one? How's your brother? That's about it."

Exchanges such as these are hardly likely to convince adolescents that older persons may be capable of offering entree to a more desirable way of life. If they suggest anything at all to a person familiar with

these environments, they are likely to remind him of conversations that adults have with other adults.

Gang-nominated adults usually aren't pushing anything. Note the contrast between the answers cited above and some typical responses of middle-class respondents to the same question:

> A WMC adult (Case #314--Physician): "Electronics, radio, hi-fi; how to fix things--that sort of thing. I have a complete workshop--I teach the boys how to do these things."
>
> A NMC adult (Case #334--Housewife): "We talk about so many things--sports, different players and the schools they went to. We discuss current events. Then we talk about school."
>
> A WMC adult (Case #730--Salesman, Electrical Equipment): "Where are you going to school? Did you get a scholarship? What are you going to major in?....Are you going to play baseball or football at school?"

Adolescent-Adult Relations As Structures Of Opportunity

The material in the preceeding table appropriately introduces our final topic--intergenerational relations as structures of opportunity. Here we are concerned primarily with the extent to which community adults intervene in the lives of the younger generation to shape the life chances that they will encounter. We begin at a very basic level by asking whether "significant" adults are at all concerned about the eventual fate of youngsters. After some general questions about the boys in their neighborhood, each adult respondent was asked: "Have you ever wondered about the kind of life these youngsters will lead when they grow up?" The proportion of adults answering "yes" appears in Table 9.

Table 9 About Here

Taking these proportions as rough indicators of adult interest, we find that interest is highest among adults in touch with youngsters who are not

in gangs. Interest is almost universal among LC adults. Note that the question was phrased in terms of the adult ever wondering about what would happen to the boys. The choice of this term was deliberate. We could have asked, for example, if they were interested, or concerned or whether they ever worried about the subject at all. As it was finally phrased, the question was intended to cover all of these gradations--which might be seen as points along a continuum reflecting each adults' sense of personal involvement in the life chances of the youngsters he knew. This point is worth mentioning because the probability is high that LC adults tended to wonder because they were worried. LC adults (and NLC adults in particular) are often caretakers; LC adults tend to dislike the neighborhoods where they work and often live.[19] For persons such as these, wondering about the fate of adolescents will often reflect a conviction that youngsters must be protected from the more threatening events that exist in their environments. On the other hand, it seems likely that middle class adults wonder because they are interested. They are interested because it is "only natural" for MC adults to be interested in the life chances of adolescents, just as it is "only natural" for them when they meet, to talk of school and sports (cf. Table 8).[20]

Gang-nominated adults wonder less often. Perhaps they are less interested, or less concerned, or less worried. Perhaps they view the outcome of the lives of these boys as a foregone conclusion. In the absence of any follow-up items in the schedule to clarify these questions, any conclusion drawn is necessarily speculative. However, accepting the logic of the question they were asked, we are left to conclude that gang-nominated adults less often report a sense of personal involvement in the life-chances of the youngsters they know.

As we have already suggested, there may be a number of dimensions to this sense of personal involvement. Still, the entire issue might not occur to some persons if it were not <u>forced</u> upon their attention by the adolescents themselves. A relevant question then becomes: How many of these respondents have ever been <u>approached</u> by boys concerned about their performance in conventional structures of opportunity? This question was asked, and the relevant data appear in Table 10.

Table 10 About Here

Looking first at Section A of the table (school problems), we note a pattern of responses similar to that observed in Table 9. Non-gang boys are <u>most</u> likely to approach community adults concerning their problems at school, gang boys are <u>least</u> likely to do so. The answers are especially striking because they bear almost no relation to the number and the severity of the problems that these boys actually experience in school. Gang boys, by a large margin, are most likely to experience difficulties in school,[21] yet they are least likely to bring these problems to the attention of the older persons they know.

Section B of the table tells a similar story. More than any other group, the gang boys need jobs and need advice about finding them, yet it is mainly their LC peers who turn to adults for consultation. Above we noted that gang-nominated adults less often feel subjectively involved in the life chances of these boys. One reason for this fact may well be that gang boys <u>less often approach adults to discuss the problems they experience in conventional structures of opportunity</u>.

Table 11 presents further data relevant to this point. In constructing the interview schedule we attempted to develop a list of school problems that would give adequate coverage to difficulties encountered by boys of widely divergent social backgrounds. The list was constructed on the basis of data from pretest versions of our instrument, supplemented by information from interviews with the boys and observational material concerning their adjustment to school. The list of specific school problems that was eventually handed to the respondents contained 22 items. Each adult was asked to read the list, and then to indicate the particular problems that had been mentioned in his conversations with the boys.

Table 11 About Here

We were confident that a large number of these items would evoke sizeable differences in the responses of gang and LC respondents; many of the items, in fact, were aimed directly at problems that we knew were much more severe among members of delinquent gangs. The data in Table 11, reporting the responses of NG and NLC adults, suggests that our whole approach to this problem. however commendable it may have seemed at the time, was dead wong. NLC adults are more likely to report conversations with the boys regardless of the type of problem involved.

Thus we know that gang boys get poorer grades in school, but NLC boys more often talk to adults about this problem. We know that financial problems are more likely to interrupt the schooling of gang boys, but NLC boys more often bring this issue to the attention of the older persons they know. To put it simply, we were unable to locate any school problem at all that NG boys were more likely to discuss with adults. Yet NG boys, objectively, are much less successful in their adjustments to school.

The decision not to turn to adults for assistance probably is related to a variety of factors, including the attitudes of the adults. Perhaps the boys sense that adults are less than concerned about their future. Another factor, suggested earlier, is that the generations tend to interact as equals; gang-nominated adults are not cast in the role of helpers for these youngsters, and the boys are able to avoid the sense of dependence that such a relationship would involve. It is no surprise therefore, to learn that gang boys are less likely to define local adults as potent and effective individuals. This finding, based on interviews conducted with the boys, has been reported elsewhere.[22] Finally, we should note that gang-nominated adults less often view these boys as victims of a system of events and circumstances in which they (the adults) are a key link. If the boys do poorly in school it is their own fault. Gang-nominated adults, when they were asked to identify the cause of the school problems of gang boys, overwhelmingly laid the blame on the personal characteristics of the boys themselves. The youngsters were described as "stupid", "lazy", "indifferent", and so on. One WG respondent, when asked why the boys were apt to do poorly in school, phrased it this way (Case #539--Grocery Store Owner):

> "They just don't care about school. They're lazy bums. All they care about is running around and having fun."

This man's comment amounts to a self-fulfilling prophecy. The boys will do poorly in school and do poorly on the jobs they get. Why bother to help? So, of course, adults don't help. And the boys do poorly.

Conclusions

From the material presented above, and from other project data, it is obvious that gang boys are enmeshed in an interlocking chain of circumstances

which profoundly affects their chances for mobility. Its major elements can be outlined as follows:

1. Members of delinquent gangs tend to be involved with older persons who possess few of the characteristics that might qualify an adult to improve an adolescent's performance in conventional structures of opportunity. The adults they know tend to be low in status. Few of them are committed to the goal of "helping" adolescents as part of a formal caretaker role.

2. Compared to other respondents, the typical gang-nominated adult is simply <u>less concerned</u> with the whole problem of offering opportunities to youngsters. For gang communities, the generations do not interact in a fashion that makes this problem explicit. Adults are seldom reminded that they may have an important role to play in affecting the life chances of a younger generation.

3. NG and WG adults, as disinterested and uninvolved witnesses to the failure of gang boys in conventional structures of opportunity, pin the <u>blame</u> for these failures on the boys. The youngsters, they feel, are incompetent.

4. Perhaps the boys sense that this evaluation has been made. We do know that gang boys are less likely to describe their adult neighbors as potent and effective individuals. Thus gang-nominated adults present a negative picture of the personal qualities of the boys they know; and the boys respond in kind.

5. Finally, and inevitably, when problems <u>do</u> arise for these youngsters, especially problems affecting their life-chances, <u>they are less often referred to older persons for solution</u>. Adults (the boys seem to be saying) do not <u>care</u>. And even if they <u>do</u> care, they are <u>powerless</u> to act.

This study, like that of Kobrin and his associates,[23] suggests modification of the Cloward and Ohlin theory of delinquent gangs, and of other formulations concerning youth subcultures. The adolescent boys in this study were neither as isolated from adults nor as antagonistic toward them as some theorists would have us believe. Both Negro gang boys (the Rattlers are primarily a 'conflict'group) and white gang boys (who live in an area where criminal and conventional elements are 'integrated') do have regular contacts with older persons in their communites. Perhaps the most important contribution of this study, however, is its beginning attempt to <u>specify</u> the manner in which adult-adolescent relations operate to guide (or fail to guide) the passage of youngsters through conventional structures of opportunity. Within the <u>same</u> urban communities there are profound gang-non-gang differences in the <u>types</u> of intergenerational contacts that occur. Non-gang boys are given guidelines and advice that are likely to enhance their life chances; gang-nominated adults may live in the same community but they do little to prepare the boys they know to live, as adults, in a better world.

Footnotes

*The research program of which this paper is a partial report was made possible by grants from the National Institute of Mental Health (M-3301 and MH-01758), the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, the Ford Foundation, and the Research Committee of Washington State University. The authors are grateful for this support and for the cooperation of the Program for Detached workers, YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago. Some of the data which appear in this analysis were discussed in a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association in 1964. This earlier version, "Significant Adults and Adolescent Adjustment: An Exploratory Study" was authored by James F. Short, Jr., Harvey Marshall, and Ramon J. Rivera.

[1]The most comprehensive duscussion of the design of this study is found in James F. Short, Jr., and Fred L. Strodtbeck, Group Process and Gang Delinquency, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), 1-26.

[2]Edward Reuter, "The Sociology of Adolescence," American Journal of Sociology, vol. 43 November, 1937, 421.

[3]Ernest Smith, American Youth Culture, (New York: Free Press, 1962), 26.

[4]Ibid, 19.

[5]See, for example, Ruth Benedict, "Continuities and Discontinuities in Cultural Conditioning," Psychiatry, vol. 1 May, 1938, 161-167; Kingsley Davis, "Adolescence and the Social Structure," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. 236 November, 1944, 8-16; Kingsley Davis, "The Sociology of Parent-Youth Conflict," American Sociological Review, vol. 5 August, 1940, 523-535; Talcott Parsons, "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States," Personality in Nature, Society, and Culture, edited by Clyde Kluckhohn and H. A. Murray, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949), 269-281; James S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society, (New York: The Free Press, 1961).

[6]Ivan Nye, "Adolescent Parent Adjustment: Socio-Economic Level as a Variable," American Sociological Review, vol. 16 June, 1951, 341-349; S. B. Withey and E. Douvan, A Study of Adolescent Boys, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, 1955) (mimeographed); E. Douvan and E. Kaye, Adolescent Girls (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, 1957) (mimeographed); Frederick Elkin and William Westley, "The Myth of Adolescent Culture," American Sociological Review, vol. 20 1955, 680-684; Frederick Elkin and William Westley, "The Protective Environment and Adolescent Socialization," Social Forces, vol. 35 March, 1957, 243-249.
The implications of these works, and others, for the "theory of youth culture" are discussed in Ramon J. Rivera, The Sociology of Adolescence: A Selective Review of the Literature, (Chicago: University of Chicago, National Opinion Reasearch Center, 1963), 5-29.

[7]Richard A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs, (New York: The Free Press, 1960).

[8]See, for example, James F. Short, Jr., Ramon Rivera, and Ray A. Tennyson, "Perceived Opportunities, Gang Membership, and Delinquency," American Sociological Review, vol. 30 February, 1965, 56-67.

[9]For an analysis of the behavior of Negro gang boys which relies heavily on qualitative material describing adult-adolescent integration, see Short and Strodtbeck, op. cit., 102-116.

[10]The New York School of Social Work, in conjunction with Mobilization for Youth, Inc. interviewed a stratified random sample of the adult residents of Manhattan's Lower East Side. Several of the questionnaire items employed in the New York survey were adapted for use in the Chicago study, but in sample design, and in intent, the two studies seem to be quite different. For an early report on the New York findings, see Richard A. Cloward and James A. Jones, "Social Class: Educational Attitudes and Participation", Education in Depressed Areas. Edited by A. Harry Passow, (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963), 190-216.

[11]The Negro gang (Rattlers) was highly involved in conflict activities. The delinquent behavior of boys in the white gang (Pizza Grill Boys) was less specialized. The WG (and WLC) area however, showed evidence of being an "integrated community," i.e., an area with stable relationships between carriers of conventional and criminal values.

[12]See E. Franklin Frazier, The Negro Family in the United States, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), and Charles E. King, "The Negro Maternal Family: A Product of an Economic and a Culture System," Social Forces, vol. 24 October, 1945, 100-104.

[13]Herbert Gans, The Urban Villagers, (New York: The Free Press, 1962), 142-145.

[14]Elkin and Westley (1957), op. cit.

[15]Duncan's scale is presented in Albert J. Reiss Jr., Occupations and Social Status, (New York: The Free Press, 1962), 263-275. Table 4 is adapted from Duncan's list of occupations.

[16]It should be noted that not all caretakers will receive a rank of 9 or 10. Thus one adult in the NLC group is a porter. Adults who worked as caretakers on a volunteer basis received an SES score reflecting the way they made a living, and not on the basis of their caretaker activities. Finally, female caretakers, if they were married, were coded in terms of their husband's occupation; the assumption being that the husband's position determines the SES location of the family.

[17]It is interesting to note that adult-gang boy conversations involving work infrequently touch upon the problem of finding a job for

the adolescent. In almost two-thirds (63%) of the work conversations described in the gang adult interviews, the boys and the adult respondents were simply comparing notes on the jobs that each held. This finding is consistent with our interpretation of other differences in the table.

[18]The term "get some rest in California" is a lower class Negro slang expression that refers to serving a sentence in the Cook County Jail. This facility is located on California Avenue in Chicago's South Side.

[19]Data relevant to this point were obtained. Middle class adults are most likely to "like" the communities where the boys were found. NLC adults have the most negative attitudes concerning their neighborhood.

[20]According to this line of reasoning, the small proportion of MC adults who do not wonder about the fate of adolescents (about 15% in both the NMC and WMC groups) do not wonder about the problem because the outcome is a foregone conclusion--the boys will do very well for themselves when they grow up.

[21]For a discussion of the school adjustments of the boys in the Chicago study, see Jonathan Freedman and Ramon Rivera, "Education, Social Class, and Patterns of Delinquency," paper read at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, 1962. Within each race, middle class boys are most successful in school, followed by LC boys. Gang boys make the poorest adjustments to school.

[22]See Short, Rivera and Tennyson op. cit., for the relevant data (esp. Tables 1 and 2).

[23]See Kobrin et al., "Criteria of Status Among Street Gangs," this issue.

Table 1

The Nomination Process

Status of Nominators (Adolescents)	N	Total Number of Adult Nominations	Mean Number of Nominations Per Adolescent
NG--Rattlers	33	105	3.2
NLC--Market St. Y.	15	59	3.9
NMC--Omegas	12	44	3.7
WG--Pizza Grill	19	59	3.1
WLC--St. Paul Settlement	45	176	3.9
WMC--Admirals Hi-Y	34	136	4.0

Table 2

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF ADULTS INTERVIEWED, BY RACE, CLASS AND GANG STATUS OF NOMINATORS

Status of Nominators	Adequate Interviews	Mean Number of Nominations Per Interview	Median Age of Adults Interviewed	Percent of Adults Who Are Female	Percent of Adults with Adolescents in Their Household	Percent of Adults who Occupy "Caretaker" Roles
NG	23	2.2	45	47.8	40.9	9.1
NLC	20	2.5	45	45.0	52.6	60.0
NMC	20	1.3	39	50.0	60.0	20.0
WG	27	1.5	35	22.2	22.2	18.5
WLC	23	1.5	41	43.5	50.0	31.8
WMC	33	1.3	47	24.2	51.5	42.4

Table 3

"CARETAKER" ROLES OF COMMUNITY ADULTS NOMINATED BY ADOLESCENTS;
BY STATUS OF NOMINATORS

Status of Nominators					
NG	NLC	NMC	WG	WLC	WMC
Detached Worker (9)*	Girl's Secretary YMCA (7)	Physical Director, YMCA (2)	Detached Worker (5)	Program Director, St. Paul	Executive Secretary, YMCA (5)
Minister (1)	Phys. Ed. Programmer, YMCA (6)	Physical Director, YMCA (1)	Asst. Director, Youth Club (1)	Teacher and Athletic Coach (3)	Teacher and Chairman, Phys. Ed. Department (3)
	Program Director, Youth Club	Group Worker, YMCA (1)	Community Relations Aide, Chicago Public Housing (1)	Teacher (2)	Assistant Scoutmaster (2)
	Group Worker, Youth Club (3)	Teacher (1)	Counselor, Chicago Youth Advisors (1)**	Teacher (1)	School Counselor (2)
	Administrative Assistant YMCA (3)		Lawyer (1)***	Teacher (1)	Minister (2)
	Executive Secretary, YMCA (2)			Volunteer Group Worker, St. Paul (1)	Minister and Pastor of Youth (1)
	Game Room Instructor, Youth Club (2)			Minister (1)	Minister and Pastor of Youth (1)
	Porter, YMCA (1)				Minister (1)
	Secretary, Youth Club, (1)				Priest (1)

Status of Nominators					
NG	NLC	NMC	WG	WLC	WMC
	Teacher (1)				Scoutmaster (1)
	Teacher (1)				Teacher and High School Band Director (1)
	Teacher (1)				Sunday School Teacher and Member, Boy Scout Troop Committee (1)
					Teacher (1)
					Straight Life Group Worker (1)****

*Numbers in parens indicate the number of boys nominating this adult.

**This organization provides voluntary counseling services for adolescents on probation or parole.

***This adult has defended several of the WG boys in court.

****A religious organization aimed at guiding the moral development of adolescents.

Table 4

SELECTED OCCUPATIONS BY DECILE RANK AND

SOCIO-ECONOMIC INDEX

Occupation	Decile	Socio-economic index
Lawyer	10	93
Electrical Engineer	10	84
Accountant	10	78
Teacher	10	70
Recreation or Group Worker	10	67
Social Worker (except group)	9	64
Real Estate Agent	9	62
Clergyman	9	52
Sales Clerk	8	47
Electrician	8	44
Policeman	8	40
T.V. Repairman	7	36
Plumber	7	34
Bus Driver	6	24
Welder	6	25
Auto Mechanic	5	19
Bartender	5	19
Operative (manufacturing)	4	17
Waiter	4	16
Cook	4	15
Laborer (metal industry)	3	14
Farm Owner or Tenant	3	14
Taxi Driver	2	10
Janitor	2	9
Construction Laborer	2	7
Porter	1	4

Table 5

MEAN DECILE RANKS:
SOCIAL STATUS OF CARETAKERS AND OTHER ADULTS, BY STATUS OF ORIGIN OF ADOLESCENT NOMINATORS

A. Caretakers And Other Community Adult Respondents

Source Of Mean Decile Ranks	Status of Nominators					
	NG	NLC	NMC	WG	WLC	WMC
Adult Respondents Who Are Caretakers	$9.5_{(2)}$	$9.3_{(12)}$	$10.0_{(4)}$	$9.4_{(5)}$	$8.7_{(7)}$	$9.6_{(14)}$
Other Community Adult Respondents	$3.6_{(21)}$	$2.6_{(8)}$	$7.9_{(16)}$	$5.4_{(22)}$	$5.3_{(15)}$	$9.2_{(19)}$
Observed Difference	+5.9	+6.7	+2.1	+4.0	+3.4	+0.4

B. All Community Adult Respondents And Adolescent Nominators

Source Of Mean Decile Ranks	Status of Nominators					
	NG	NLC	NMC	WG	WLC	WMC
All Community Adult Respondents	$4.1_{(23)}$	$6.7_{(20)}$	$8.3_{(20)}$	$6.1_{(27)}$	$6.4_{(22)}$	$9.4_{(33)}$
Status Of Origin Of Nominators (Adolescents)	$3.0_{(33)}$	$3.7_{(15)}$	$6.1_{(12)}$	$3.9_{(19)}$	$5.5_{(45)}$	$9.2_{(34)}$
Observed Difference	+1.1	+3.0	+2.2	+2.2	+0.9	+0.2

Table 6

ADOLESCENT-ADULT CONTACTS

Status Of Nominators (Adolescents)	Number Of Boys In Group	When Presented With A Roster Of The Names Of The Boys In The Group Responsible For Nomination, The Typical Adult Respondent:	
		Was Able To Recognize The Names Of...	And Said That He (She) Saw Each Of These Boys, During An Average Week, About....
NG	33	6 Boys	5 Times
NLC	15	11 Boys	3 Times
NMC	12	4 Boys	3 Times
WG	19	7 Boys	2 Times
WLC	45	4 Boys	4 Times
WMC	34	6 Boys	3 Times

Table 7

SELECTED RESPONSES OF COMMUNITY ADULTS TO THE QUESTION: "WHERE DO YOU GENERALLY SEE THESE BOYS?", BY RACE, CLASS AND GANG STATUS OF NOMINATORS.

Settings For Adult-Adolescent Contact	Status of Nominators					
	NG	NLC	NMC	WG	WLC	WMC
Around the Neighborhood	68.2	38.9	20.0	76.0	47.8	51.5
Centers For Organized Adolescent Activities	0.0	50.0	35.0	4.0	30.4	97.0
Home of Adult, Or Home of Adolescent	22.7	11.1	85.0	28.0	56.5	48.5
At Work	9.0	22.0	10.0	32.0	17.4	9.1
100% =	22	18	20	25	23	33

N	141
NA	5
Total N (Adults)	

Table 8

Selected Responses Of Adults To The Question: "What Are Some Of The Things You're Likely To Talk About When You See Them,?" By Race, Class, And Gang Status Of Nominators

Selected Responses	Status of Nominators					
	NG	NLC	NMC	WG	WLC	WMC
School	4.5	55.6	60.0	7.7	47.8	72.7
Work	36.4	22.2	20.0	42.3	30.4	12.1
Conventional Adolescent Interests (Cars, Sports, Etc.)	18.0	55.6	60.0	49.9	87.0	63.7
Neighborgood Gossip, Casual Greetings, etc.	54.6	38.9	30.0	61.5	34.7	26.3
100% =	22	18	20	26	23	33

N	142
NA	4
	146

Table 9

Percent Of Adults Responding "Yes" To The Question: "Have You Ever Wondered About The Kind Of Life These Youngsters Will Lead When They Grow Up?," By Race, Class And Gang Status Of Nominators

Status of Nominators					
NG	NLC	NMC	WG	WLC	WMC
65.2 (23)	95.0 (20)	85.0 (20)	55.6 (27)	95.6 (23)	84.8 (33)

N	146
NA	0
Total N	146

Table 10

School And Work

A. Problems At School

Percent of Adults Responding "Yes" To The Question: "Has Any Boy On That List Ever Spoken To You About His Problems At School?," By Race, Class, And Gang Status of Nominators

Status of Nominator

NG	NLC	NMC	WG	WLC	WMC
39.1 (23)	85.0 (20)	50.0 (20)	40.0 (25)	78.3 (23)	59.4 (32)

N	143
NA	3
Total N	146

B. Finding A Job

Percent of Adults Responding "Yes" To The Question: "Has Any Boy On That List Ever Spoken To You About How He Should Go About Finding A Job?," By Race, Class, And Gang Status Of Nominators

Status of Nominator

NG	NLC	NMC	WG	WLC	WMC
47.8 (23)	75.0 (20)	50.0 (20)	53.8 (26)	73.9 (23)	33.3 (33)

N	145
NA	1
Total N	146

Table 11

PERCENT OF NG AND NLC COMMUNITY ADULTS WHO HAVE DISCUSSED SPECIFIC SCHOOL PROBLEMS WITH BOYS THEY KNOW.

Question: "Have You Ever Spoken To A Teenage Boy Who (Cite Specific Problem) And Advised Him About What To Do?"	Status Of Nominators		Observed Difference
Problems Cited	NG	NLC	
. . . hadn't learned much from his earlier school work and was finding it difficult to catch up	17.4	70.0	+52.6
. . . was having difficulty getting along with his fellow students	4.3	55.0	+50.7
. . . was a slow learner and having a hard time making fair grades at school .	30.4	80.0	+49.6
. . . felt that it cost too much money to continue with school	13.0	60.0	+47.0
. . . wanted to return to school, but felt that he was too old to go back . . .	21.7	65.0	+43.3
. . . felt that he had to help out his parents financially and couldn't stay in school	21.7	65.0	+43.3
. . . wanted more spending money and felt he couldn't get it if he stayed in school	21.7	65.0	+43.3
. . . just didn't like the school he went to	17.4	60.0	+42.6
. . . couldn't decide what to take at school	8.7	50.0	+41.3
. . . was wondering about how to finance a college education	4.3	45.0	+40.7
. . . was wondering about the college he should apply to	4.3	45.0	+40.7
. . . felt that he wanted to enter the Armed Service instead of going to school	30.4	70.0	+39.6

Problems Cited (Continued)	Status of Nominators		Observed Difference
	NG	NLC	
. . . simply wasn't applyint himself to his school work	26.1	65.0	+38.9
. . . felt that his teachers weren't doing a good job	21.7	60.0	+38.3
. . . tried hard, but just didn't seem to be lucky in school	21.7	60.0	+38.3
. . . just couldn't seem to get interested in his school-work	39.1	75.0	+35.9
. . . felt that his teachers were asking him to do too much work	30.4	65.0	+34.6
. . . was trying to decide whether he should go to college	8.7	40.0	+31.3
. . . was having difficulty getting along with his teachers and felt they didn't like him	43.5	70.0	+26.5
. . . wanted to return to school, but didn't know how to go about getting back in	26.1	50.0	+23.9
. . . felt that he wanted to get married instead of going to school	21.7	40.0	+18.3
. . . was a truant and spent a lot of time away from school	43.5	55.0	+11.5
100% =	23	20	

N	43
NA	0
TOTAL N (NG & NLC Adults)	43